

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA**

FRANCO RIBEIRO and DEANNA)
RIBEIRO, as individuals and as next)
friends and biological parents of)
Lucas Ribeiro, an infant,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.)
)
)
BABY TREND, INC., a corporation,)
MARK SEDLACK, MILLENIUM)
DEVELOPMENT CORP., INDIANA)
MILLS & MANUFACTURING INC.,)
LERADO GROUP CO., LTD.,)
LERADO GROUP (HOLDING))
COMPANY, LTD., LERADO)
(ZHONG SHAN) INDUSTRIAL CO.,)
LTD., LERADO CHINA LIMITED,)
LERADO H.K. LIMITED,)
HOLMBERGS SAFETY SYSTEM)
HOLDING AB, GNOSJOGRUPPEN)
AB, HOLMBERGS CHILDSAFETY)
AB, GNOTECH REFTELE AB, Maxi)
MILIAAN B.V., and DOREL)
INDUSTRIES, INC.,)
)
Defendants.)

This matter is before the court on the motion for leave to extend ([Filing No. 416](#)) filed by Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs request an order extending the deadline to respond to the Motions to Dismiss ([Filing No. 393](#) and [Filing No. 394](#)) filed by Defendants Dorel Industries, Inc., (“Dorel”) and Maxi Miliaan B.V. (“Maxi”), until the underlying case is resolved.

Dorel and Maxi were added as defendants in the Plaintiffs' Seventh Amended Complaint. ([Filing No. 328](#)). Plaintiffs allege that the liability of Dorel and Maxi is

contingent upon the liability of the “Lerado” defendants because Dorel and Maxi are Lerado’s successors in interest. ([Filing No. 319 at p. 2](#)). On December 29, 2015, this court bifurcated the successor liability portion of this case, ordering that it would be addressed, if necessary, “following resolution of the underlying liability matters in this action.” (Filing No. 324).

Dorel and Maxi have filed a response to the present motion affirmatively stating that they do not oppose Plaintiffs’ motion for an extension of time to respond to Dorel’s and Maxi’s motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction until after the liability of the Lerado defendants is determined. ([Filing No. 422](#)). Therefore, the court finds Plaintiffs’ motion should be granted. Dorel’s and Maxi’s motions to dismiss shall be held in abeyance until the Lerado defendants’ liability is determined in the underlying case. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The motion to extend response deadline ([Filing No. 416](#)) filed by Plaintiffs is granted.
2. The motion to dismiss ([Filing No. 393](#)) filed by Defendant Maxi Miliaan, B.V and the motion to dismiss ([Filing No. 394](#)) filed by Defendant Dorel Industries, Inc. shall be held in abeyance until the Lerado defendants’ liability is resolved in the underlying action.
3. In the event the Lerado defendants are found liable, the court will re-set the briefing schedule a reasonable time thereafter as to Dorel and Maxi’s motions to dismiss ([Filing No. 393](#) and [Filing No. 394](#)).

DATED: April 18, 2016.

BY THE COURT:

**s/ F.A. Gossett
United States Magistrate Judge**